

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VICTORIA CASTRO, et al.,

Plaintiff,

CIV-S-05-0130 DFL GGH PS

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendant.

ORDER

On July 20, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. Plaintiff filed objections on August 8, 2005, and they were considered by the district judge.

This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are

\\\\\\

1 reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir.  
2 1983).


3 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,  
4 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the Proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.

5 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

6 1. The Proposed Findings and Recommendations filed July 20, 2005, are  
7 ADOPTED; and

8 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 11-110 (E.D. Cal.  
9 1997); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

10 DATED: 10/21/2005

11  
12   
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 DAVID F. LEVI  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26